

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 16-23, 26, and 28-29 are pending in the present application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 10, 17, and 28 are amended, claim 30 is added, and claim 27 is cancelled without prejudice. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **Newly Added Claim**

Claim 30 is added and is believed to be supported at least by figures 5(a)-5(c), and paragraphs 27 and 42-46 of applicant's U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0260761.

It is respectfully submitted, that at the very least, the combination of U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0002521 to Traversat, U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0025669 to Hughes, and U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0217140 to Burbeck, does not disclose or suggest "*a service provider that is configured to provide a plurality of Web service descriptor files (WSDLs), wherein each WSDL corresponds to a search type*" and "*a querying device that is connected to the service provider and configured to request a WSDL from the service provider corresponding to one of the search types*", as recited in claim 30.

Traversat merely teaches (in paragraph 202) that a field of a service advertisement, i.e., a service advertisement access method field, may refer to a WSDL.

Even if a peer of Traversat requests a service advertisement that includes a reference to a WSDL, it does not include the actual WSDL. Further, there is no teaching in Traversat of the referenced WSDL corresponding to a search type.

Hughes makes no mention of a WSDL. While Burbeck teaches use of a WSDL, it is merely used to bind a service found within a registry (see e.g., paragraph 57 of Burbeck).

### Claim Rejections- § 103

1. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14, 16-19, and 21-23, and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0002521 to Traversat in view of U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0025669 to Hughes, as set forth by pages 2-12 of the Office Action.

It is respectfully submitted that Traversat in combination with Hughes does not disclose or suggest, “*a seeker device receives a search form including a plurality of search entry fields from a Web Service Provider, wherein the entry fields are provided for entering data and the search form is devoid of entered data when received by the seeker device” and “wherein a user of the seeker device manually enters data into at least one of the search entry fields”, as recited in amended claim 1.*

The Web Service Provider essentially provides a pre-formatted search form with blank data entry fields, while a user of the seeker device enters data into one or more of the blank data entry fields. In this way, seeker device is prevented from entering data unless a corresponding entry field is already present in the search form.

The Examiner contends that Hughes’ teaching (in paragraph 50) of a search query initiated by a user and communicated to a server discloses a device receiving a search form including a plurality of fields from a Web Service Provider.

However, since the search query of Hughes is initiated by a user, it is the user that **both** formats the query (e.g., chooses what fields it will contain) and enters data for the query (e.g., enters data for the chosen fields). This differs from claim 1, where the formatting of the search form and the entering of data into the search form are handled by different entities (e.g., respectively by the Web Server and the seeker device). Further, there is no teaching in Hughes of the search query being provided from a Web Service

Provider. For example, Hughes merely teaches the query being initiated by a user, but not a Web Service Provider. Further, the deficiencies of Hughes in these regard are not cured by Traversat.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of Hughes and Traversat does not disclose or suggest, *a seeker device receives a search form including a plurality of search entry fields from a Web Service Provider, wherein the entry fields are provided for entering data and the search form is devoid of entered data when received by the seeker device*” and “*wherein a user of the seeker device manually enters data into at least one of the search entry fields*”, as essentially recited in claim 1. Thus claim 1, is believed to be patentable over Hughes and Traversat.

Claims 10, 17, and 28 were amended in manner similar to claim 1 and believed to be patentable over Hughes and Traversat for at least similar reasons to claim 1.

Claim 27 was cancelled without prejudice.

Clams 2-4, 6-9, 11, 13-16, 18-19, 21-23, 26, and 29 are believed to be patentable over Hughes and Traversat at least by virtue of their dependence from their base claims.

2. Claims 5 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat and Hughes, in view of U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0217140 to Burbeck, as set forth by pages 12-13 of the Office Action.

This 103 rejection is premised, in part, on the Examiner’s reliance on Traversat and Hughes as disclosing all elements of claims 1 and 17, where claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 20 depends from claim 17.

However, Traversat and Hughes do not disclose or suggest all the elements of claims 1 and 17 for the reasons discussed above. For example, the combination of Traversat and Hughes do not disclose or suggest *a seeker device receives a search form*

*including a plurality of search entry fields from a Web Service Provider, wherein the entry fields are provided for entering data and the search form is devoid of entered data when received by the seeker device” and “wherein a user of the seeker device manually enters data into at least one of the search entry fields”. Further the deficiencies of Traversat and Hughes in these regard are not cured by Burbeck.*

Accordingly, the combination of Traversat, Hughes and Burbeck cannot render obvious claims 5 and 20.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By: Donald B. Paschburg  
Donald B. Paschburg  
Reg. No. 33,753  
Attorney for Applicant

### **Correspondence Address:**

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
(732) 321-3191